

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/686,508	10/14/2003	Gregory A. Hubbard	GP-304193	3535
7590 04/21/2005			EXAMINER	
Leslie Hodges			LOUIS JACQUES, JACQUES H	
General Motors Corporation, Legal Staff Mail Code: 482-C23-B21			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P.O. Box 300			3661	
Detroit, MI 48265-3000			DATE MAILED: 04/21/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/686,508	HUBBARD ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Jacques H Louis-Jacques	3661				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apor Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by staturely received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin ply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day I will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 (	October 2003.					
·		is action is non-final.					
3)[	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	ion of Claims						
5)⊠ 6)□ 7)⊠	4)  Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  5)  Claim(s) 6-9 is/are allowed.  6)  Claim(s) 1-4 and 10-13 is/are rejected.  7)  Claim(s) 5,14 and 15 is/are objected to.  8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Applicati	ion Papers						
9)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.					
·	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac		Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the E		•				
Priority u	under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>							
Attachmen	t(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🖂 Intonious Summan	(PTO.413)				
2) Notice	te of References Cited (PTO-892) the of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 tr No(s)/Mail Date 10142003.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:					

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Information Disclosure Statement

1. The references cited in the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed on October 14, 2003 have been considered. An initialed copy of PTO form 1449 is attached herewith.

## Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Paragraph [0001] on page 1 of the specification is incomplete. Applicant is suggested to provide the missing serial number and the status of the application.

Appropriate correction is required.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1-4 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loeffler et al [6,154,701] in view of Yamaguchi et al [US 2002/0062183].

Loeffler et al '701 discloses a method and device for controlling the drive train of motor vehicle. The drive train, according to Loeffler et al, includes an engine (101) and a transmission (106). According to Loeffler et al, as set forth in columns 2 and 3, a set of operating region for the transmission (i.e., an output operating region and an input

Art Unit: 3661

operating) is defined or pregiven. Furthermore, according to Loeffler et al, there is provided, for points of operation within the output operating region of interest, determining preferred operating points within the input operating region. Loeffler et al further disclose defining an operating space for the powertrain in transmission input speed, transmission input torque, transmission output speed and transmission output torque. See column 4. However, while Loeffler et al discloses determining the preferred operating points while considering several criteria (e.g., total efficiency of the drive train of the vehicle), Loeffler et al does not particularly teach that the preferred operating points within the input region are determined as a function of preselected losses within the powertrain. Yamaguchi et al, on the other hand, discloses a control system for hybrid vehicle having a hybrid powertrain including an electric motor (103) and a battery (112). The vehicle powertrain system also includes an engine (101) and a transmission (104). See, for example, figure 28. Yamaguchi et al discloses determining operating points as a function of preselected losses within the powertrain. See pages 6, 12, 13 and 14. Yamaguchi et al also discloses determining at least one operating region for a region within the operating space corresponding to system operation as zero battery power. See figures 3-4 and 12-13. See also figures 34-38, page 12. The preselected losses, according to Yamaguchi et al, are selected from the group consisting of engine losses, transmission losses, motor losses and battery losses and combinations thereof. See pages 13 and 14. Thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to be motivated to modify the drivetrain control of Loeffler et al by incorporating the features from the control system for hybrid vehicle of Yamaguchi et al because such Application/Control Number: 10/686,508 Page 4

Art Unit: 3661

modification, as suggested by Yamaguchi et al (page 1) would improve the efficiency of the system.

## Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 5, 14 and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. Claims 6-9 are allowed.

The prior art do not particularly teach, in combination with the other features, determining a first set of preferred operating points corresponding to unconstrained battery usage and second set of preferred operating points corresponding to fully constrained used. The prior art also fails to teach mapping valid combinations of input operating points within the input operating region and output operating points within the operating region to a measure of powertrain system losses as the valid combinations and, for operating points within the operating region, selecting input operating points within the input operating region from mapped valid combinations corresponding to predetermined criteria.

#### Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

6,064,934 Zhang May 2000

Application/Control Number: 10/686,508 Page 5

Art Unit: 3661

6,751,960	Arimitsu et al	Jun. 2004
6,814,688	Foelsche et al	Nov. 2004
6,842,686	Homeyer et al	Jan. 2005
6.847.877	Homever	Jun. 2005

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacques H Louis-Jacques whose telephone number is 571-272-6962. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 5:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Black can be reached on 571-272-6956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jacques H Louis-Jacques Primary Examiner Art Unit 3661